



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Sir.—I have to thank Mr. E. Fitch for his courteous and valuable criticism of my edition of the text of Apollonius Rhodius in the Amer. Journ. Phil. of July last (which I have only recently seen), and particularly for his recognition that my edition is independent of Merkel's. Mr. Fitch charges me with a want of scientific precision in the formation of my apparatus criticus because I have not in all cases noticed the readings of L and G, the principal MSS, also because I have used the sign "vulg.", the result being a certain inconsistency between the preface and the critical notes. I admit the facts and I admit the inconsistency. My defence must take the form of a plea of "confession and avoidance". In the preface I thought it right to set out the state of the text, showing the relations of the manuscripts, but at the same time (after deliberation) I came to the conclusion that the conditions imposed upon me did not allow of my stating all the different readings of L and G but only the more important differences, and this I maintain that I have done. Thus, to take one case referred to, the impossible *δερκομένη* of L in IV 170, I did not quote it because it was an impossible reading, and because it was of no value as a guide. Mr. Fitch says "the readings of a manuscript like L are worth knowing, even when they are palpably wrong, for they may contain a hint of the truth." If for the words *for they may contain* we substitute *if in that case they contain*, I would accept the statement as representing my practice. I may of course have made mistakes in detail and Mr. Fitch has pointed out some corrections that are needed, but I do not wish to seem unintentionally inconsistent.

With regard to "vulg." I admit that it is unscientific, but it is a convenient mark to express the agreement of most codd. and edd. where an exhaustive critical apparatus is not feasible. I dislike it, however, as much as Mr. Fitch does.

With regard to other matters, a slight inconsistency between a remark in the preface and a reading in the text is due to a final alteration in the text without the consequential alteration having been made in the preface—a slip for which of course I must bear the blame. I have often wondered whether any one would point it out. In IV 289, *διχῆ* should read *διχῆ*; somehow the mistake escaped correction in proof.

ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL, LONDON,
May 28, 1902.

R. C. SEATON.